IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division

Amdocs (Israel) Limited, Plaintiff, v. Openet Telecom, Inc. *et al.*, Defendants.	Civil Action No. 1:10cv910 (LMB/TRJ)

O R D E R

Upon consideration of defendants' motion to enforce the Rule 16(b) scheduling order (no. 29), plaintiff's opposition (no. 33), and plaintiff's supplemental augmented initial disclosures, the court finds that plaintiff has now submitted adequate Rule 26(a)(1) disclosures on the matters in issue. The court further finds that in the circumstances presented here, defendants' request for an order barring plaintiff from alleging priority, conception, and reduction to practice dates earlier than those identified in plaintiff's initial disclosures is unwarranted.

Accordingly, as to the adequacy of plaintiff's disclosures, defendants' motion is MOOT; as to barring plaintiff from alleging earlier dates, defendants' motion is DENIED.

It is so ORDERED.

ENTERED this 25th day of January, 2011.

/s/
Thomas Rawles Jones, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge

Alexandria, Virginia